Men, Monkeys *and* Missing Links

BY

ARTHUR I. BROWN

M.D., CM., F.R.C.S.E.

ARTHUR I. BROWN
M.D., C.M., F.R.C.S.E.

Men, Monkeys and Missing Links

By
ARTHUR I. BROWN
M. D., C. M., F. R. C. S. E.

GLENDALE NEWS COMMERCIAL PRINTING CO.
Glendale, Calif.

Men, Monkeys and Missing Links

The title of this booklet is not intended to convey the impression that evolutionists claim direct relationship for the human race with the monkey. We are informed that our ancestor was some "unknown" and vanished anthropoid. Monkeys, according to the latest pronouncement of science, occupy only one branch of this common family tree and yet Darwin in his "Descent of Man," Chapter 6, made the statement that man comes from the "Old World Monkey."

Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, says on page 4 of Guide Leaflet Series No. 52, May, 1921: "Man is not descended from any known form of ape, either living or fossil." But he still believes that he is descended from something of which there is not the slightest trace. And this is called "Science!"

The writer will deal only with the "missing link" phase of evolution, and the subject will be discussed wholly from a scientific standpoint. Much of the argument and most of the facts are taken from Alfred Watterson McCann's book, "God—or Gorilla," the most scathing and unanswerable indictment ever published against the untenable hypothesis. For those interested in the question, but without the opportunity or inclination to read this great work, a synopsis of a small portion of it, with the addition of other relevant data, will be helpful.

The assertions of the evolutionists are strikingly dogmatic, and the conclusions drawn from certain discoveries are said to prove beyond a doubt that man has developed from some lower form of life.

An example of the absurdly grotesque extremes to which some scientific writers are prepared to go, is to be found in a series of articles on "The Story of Man and His World" now appearing in "Popular Science" under the signature of Professor E. E. Free, Ph. D., Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The article in the May number, 1923, has an additional sponsor, Professor Wm. K. Gregory, Curator of Comparative Anatomy, American Museum of Natural History. The Article is titled: "Man—An Invention," and attempts to show how our first ancestor, a "speck of sea-slime," decided that it would like to possess the power of motion, and so proceeded to invent muscle! Then followed a wonderful series of "inventions"—bone, blood, warm blood, legs, backbone, organs, etc. Strange to say, very late in the process, when considerable of this amazing and difficult work had been accomplished after millions of years of hard labor and planning, a "brain capable of real thinking" was produced! One may be pardoned for expressing the conviction that a brain and some "real thinking" were necessary for the "invention" of muscle, bone, blood, etc.! The article is a scientific monstrosity, but is constantly being duplicated by presumably educated scientific authors, considered to be authorities. How can any sane individual swallow such clap-trap?

We are told also that man has been in existence on this planet for a period of some 500,000 years. The scientific world was shocked when Theodore Moreaux, Director of Observatory at Bourges, entered the controversy in February, 1921, and asserted that these extraordinary figures, as all the fossils show, are preposterous and that the human race cannot boast of

more than a few thousands of years instead of the hundreds of thousands claimed by certain palaeontologists.

The length of time since the glacial period is important as showing how long man has been on the earth. It is interesting to note that the ice-age experts unanimously repudiate the half-million year period. Planck names 20,000 years. De Geers 9,000, Sollas 7,000, while Wright, the foremost American authority, furnishes much evidence to prove that 5,000 years covers all the requirements of science.

These calculations, which cannot be laughed out of court, make the estimates of the evolutionists look ridiculous, but they are apparently ignored by the men determined to prove an ape ancestry for the human race.

Professor Arthur Keith, an eminent evolutionist authority, with no evidence whatever, demands 350,000 years for the period which has elapsed since the glacial skeletons were buried. Keith is an anthropologist of the highest standing, but does not profess to rank as a geologist. George Frederick Wright is an eminent geologist who makes no profession of expertness in anatomy. Wright says, "The Origin and Antiquity of man," 1912, page 195: "Large areas in Europe and North America which are now principal centers of civilization were buried under glacial ice thousands of feet thick, while the civilization of Babylonia (5,000 to 6,000 years ago) was in its heyday. The glib manner in which many, not to say most, popular writers speak of the Glacial Epoch as far distant in geological time, is due to ignorance of facts which would seem to be so clear that he who runs might read."

The same confusion exists in regard to the many guesses at the age of the world. Astronomers, basing their estimates on energy and heat, conclude that this

planet came into existence 100,000,000 years ago. Geologists, on the other hand, are quite certain the world is at least 500,000,000 years old—a slight discrepancy of 400,000,000 years! The truth is that the conclusions of science are often the merest guesswork and have changed times without number. Some recent estimates are 4,000,000,000 to 5,000,000,000 years.

If evolution is accepted as a fact, that is, if the human body has been evolved from simple forms of plant and animal life, the simple becoming complex by gradual changes in form and feature, and in size, shape and function of the various organs, these changes extending over millions of years, then, necessarily there must have been intermediary forms or links between species. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that these connecting links are absolutely essential, must have existed and ought to be found somewhere in the world if we are to believe the theory. New and higher species must have come from earlier and lower species, this process being repeated over and over again until ultimately, after aeons of time, man was produced.

Professor Vernon Kellogg, of Leland Stanford University, in his "Darwinism To-day," 1908, page 18, says: "Speaking by and large we only tell the general truth when we declare that no indubitable cases of species-forming or transforming, that is, of descent, have been observed." And then on page 29 we find these words: "For my part is seems better to go back to the old and safe "Ignoramus' standpoint." If the evolutionists themselves admit the absence of all evidence of changing species, what becomes of their theory that connecting links between species have existed?

And yet the four corners of the earth have been and are being searched for fossil remains, the bony

remnants of these elusive curiosities. Many expeditions have hopefully wended their way into the heart of the Old World, only to return unsuccessful.

Raymond L. Ditmars, curator of mammals and reptiles of the Zoological Gardens, Bronx Park, New York City, is a firm believer in the theory that "our apish grandsires chattered love amid the cocoanut branches of the unexplored jungles long before Adam ever lost his spare-rib or Paris rolled the little red apple." In the New York Evening Telegram of August 28, 1921, he writes: "When the evasive missing link is eventually found he will be discovered tightly grasping the paw of his mate and chattering such monkey gibberish in her ears as 'Don't be afraid. We're their ancestors, you know'."

The same article announces that Ditmars is making a picture, 20,000 feet of reel, to convince the rankest unbeliever that the anthropoid apes are our real ancestors, and that these pictures are being made while an expedition, headed by Roy Andrews, is pushing into Tibet with 75 camels, four motor trucks, and four Handley-Page airplanes in search of the missing link, which Dr. Andrews expects to find in the form of an anthropid ape a thousand years advanced in evolution over the type of ape we see in captivity.

According to Ditmars, "This is the highbrow ape; it stands erect, supposedly, and displays all the characteristics of man. He will be brought back, with sufficient of his brothers and sisters, to permit a searching investigation as to his relation to humans. Only patience is needed." More than 60 years ago Sir Charles Lyell wrote in "Antiquity of Man," page 499: "At present we must be content to wait patiently, and not to allow our judgment to be influenced by want of evidence,

* * * in equatorial Africa, and in certain islands of the East Indian Archipelago, may we hope to meet hereafter with lost types of primates allied to the gorilla, chimpanzee and ourang-outang."

Sixty years have passed, and we still wait. "How long, O Lord, how long?"

In 1898, Haeckel published "The Last Link," and uses the phrase "an historical fact" in referring to the existence of this missing link. In 1906, another work by the same author, "Last Words on Evolution," gave his own pedigree of the primates, a wholly imaginary product, consisting of a mixture of absolutely fictitious creatures with really existing creatures, the connection between them being as fictitious as the creatures themselves.

And yet the editor of a prominent New York daily at late as June, 1921, uses the following words in giving expression to his unswerving faith: "None but a fool would dare criticize the theory of man's descent from an ape, because it is the commonly accepted opinion of mankind." Whom shall we follow—this cock-sure amateur or an eminent scientist like Professor W. Branco of the Geological and Palaentological Institute of Berlin University, who, in his closing address at the Fifth International Congress of Zoologists held in Berlin, August 16, 1901, took as his subject, "Fossil Man," and completely refuted Haeckel's "historical fact," "The Last Link?"

The principal facts brought out by Branco are these. It is possible to trace the ancestry of most of our present mammals among the fossils of the Tertiary period. Man appears suddenly in the Quaternary period. There is no record of any ancestor of man in the Tertiary period. The very first evidence of man's

existence on this planet, and all other evidence thus far established, proves that he made his first appearance at once as a complete true man.

Erich Wasmann, in "Modern Biology," page 478, and H. Obermaier, in "L'Anthropologie," confirm Branco when he comes to the truly scientific conclusion: "Palaentology tells us nothing on the subject—it knows no ancestors of man."

Professor Johannes Ranke, at the Anthropological Congress, Lindau, in 1899, speaking of this hypothetical common ancestor of men and apes, said: "Whilst a charming picture of the past and possibly of the future is being shown us, and whilst a fanciful design is being carried out in all directions, we are, as a rule, in quest of facts, not theories. * * * I must protest against the assumption that these facts have been really furnished by zoology and palaentology any more than by anatomy. All else is still a matter of hypothesis—a work of the imagination."

Erich Wasmann, in his book, "Modern Biology and the Theory of Evolution," page 463, adds to this as follows: "We have the pedigree of the present apes, a pedigree very rich in species and coming down from the hypothetical ancestor form of oldest Tertiary period to the present day. Zittel's 'Grandzuge der Palaontologie' gives a list of no fewer than 30 genera of fossil Pro-Simiae and 18 genera of fossil apes, the remains of which are buried in the various strata from the Lower Eocene to the close of the Alluvial epoch, but not one connecting link has been found between their hypothetical ancestral forms and man at the present time. The whole hypothetical pedigree of man is not supported by a single fossil genus or a single fossil species."

How extraordinary! If man were really descended

from a pre-historic ancestor common to him and the apes at the present day, there must surely be some fossil trace left of his existence and not merely traces of apes. Why does palaentology furnish so many and such wonderful specimens of fossil apes and not a single specimen of a hypothetical ancestor of man if they really lived side by side, as is the claim?

Prof. Osborn, ever ready with an attempt to explain the unexplainable, offers the following delicious morsel for our consideration: "Although the ancestors of man lived partly among trees and forests, they lived chiefly on the ground, where they were entombed by floods, and sandstorms." Now we understand the very mysterious disappearance of Grandfather and Grandmother Ape-like Ancestor!

Yet, the same scientists have found no difficulty in discovering the fossil remains of hundreds of the ancestors of the horse and other animals who lived "chiefly" on the ground, as well as those of monkeys and great apes of every description.

Then will someone please explain why, if the floods and sand-storms entombed all the remains of ape-men and sub-men, the same floods and sand-storms spared the fossil remains of the countless scores of smaller animals now on exhibition in all the museums of the world?

During the past 50 years several small pieces of bone have been discovered by the indefatigable fossil-hunters, and from these insignificant portions, remarkable and imaginary "reconstructions" have been made, which we are asked to believe are authentic and reliable representations of individuals once living as members of distinct races. These are labelled and exhibited as "missing links," and to look at them one might suppose,

as many do, that they are photographs or faithful and true reproductions in form and feature of our ape-men predecessors. The fact is not stressed that they are purely hypothetical curiosities constructed from a few bits of bone that one might hold in the palm of the hand. Certainly not! A "missing link" is necessary for our evolutionist friends, and if such a thing cannot be found, the only way out is to manufacture an imaginary one, hoping that those who gaze and read wide-eyed and open-mouthed, will not have the temerity to inquire too closely into the method of bringing these weird and wholly unscientific monstrosities on the stage for our inspection.

But we are really most curious and our inquisitiveness will not be denied. Prof. Osborn, before whom American evolutionists bow as their leading authority, in his exhibit now in the Hall of the Age of Man, American Museum of Natural History, New York City, shows four cases containing what he terms half-ape, half-human remains in an attempt to prove our ape ancestry.

Let us look at these four antiques and then take a brief glance at most of the other skeletons or portions of skeletons discovered at different times in various parts of the world, and used to bolster up a very wobbly hypothesis. We shall find that the supports have completely given way and the superstructure reared upon them by scientists is a hopeless mass of ruins.

The four wonderful "half and halfs" are "The Trinil Ape-Man or Pithecanthropus Erectus" (ape-man standing upright), "The Heidleberg Man," "The Gibraltar and Neanderthal Man," and "The Piltdown Man." Rather a close examination will also be made of "The Rhodesian Man," and a few observations on

other skeletons and bones of lesser importance.

In discussing all these imaginary ape-men, much is made of brain-pan capacities expressed in cubic centimeters. The largest ape skull has a capacity of about 600 c. c., while the average cranial capacity of the males of Central Europe to-day is about 1503 c. c. Prof. Osborn accepts the doctrine of the materialistic school which declares that the capacity of the skull affords a direct indication of the mental capabilities of its owner. Thus, a half-ape, half-man should show a skull of somewhere near 1000 or 1100 c. c. We shall see how this capacity is conveniently arranged. One is reminded of the old saying, "Figures never lie, but liars often figure."

Apparently the scientists do not know of the Weddas, a certainly human race of dwarfs from Ceylon, who have a skull capacity of 960 c. c., which is very much smaller but ought to be very much larger than the skull of a creature described as "500,000 years old."

It is unfortunate for the purposes of the evolutionists that few human beings today have a cranial capacity greater than that of the sub-human beings whose "restorations" inhabit the "Hall of the Age of Man"—better termed the "Hall of Confusion." It was once thought that the enormous 1965 c. c. skull of Bismarck was about the biggest thing of its kind in the world. But Professor Rudolf Virchow discovered a larger one measuring 2010 c. c., and strange to relate, it belonged not to a poet or statesman of Great Britain, Germany or France; not to any creature of any civilized nation, but to a savage of Great Britain!

One of the stumbling blocks created by Professor Osborn himself, but nowhere referred to by himself, is found in the fact that the old paleolithic skulls des-

cribed as Neanderthal, and said to be 50,000 years old, had an average capacity of 1625-1635 c. c. Some of them even measure up to 1700 c. c. And so the bottom is knocked out of the argument, which nevertheless continues to be used. Again we ask, is this Science?

(1) THE TRINIL APE-MAN, OR PITHECANTHROPUS ERECTUS

Professor Osborn and others speak of the discovery of the Trinil "Race" in Central Java, thousands of pre-humans living 500,000 years ago. The guide leaflet which is given the visitor to the Hall of the Age of Man, Museum of Natural History, New York City, draws attention to "five cases in the center of the Hall, devoted to the story of man," which he states contain "reproductions of ALL of the notable specimens that have been discovered." The whole original lot will perhaps fill a peach-basket!

The leaflet tells us of "the progressive increase of relative intelligence appreciated by the most casual observer," and draws our notice to certain "anatomical characters" such as "the increased prominence of the chin, the reduction of the eyebrow ridges, the reduction of the prominence of the lower face as a whole, the increased size of skull and brain capacity."

Osborn holds that the African negro and the Asiatic Chinaman have not evolved as far as the modern European whites. If this is true, we should expect to find the above-mentioned anatomical characteristics more pronounced in the Negroes and Chinese. But Professor Arthur Keith, frequently quoted by Osborn, at this point throws the monkey wrench into the machinery. In his book, "The Human Body," 1910, page 177, he says: "In the typical African negro

the forehead as a rule is high and the supraorbital ridges are distinctly less prominent than in the European. The supraorbital (above the eye) ridges of the Chinaman are less developed than in the European."

The "Restored Head" of the Trinil Ape-Man is made from a tiny bit of bone weighing a few ounces, and is designed to show a half-human, half-ape resemblance. This use of it is inexplicable in view of Prof. Osborn's assertion that "The Trinil Ape-Man is the first of the conundrums in human history." Then he asks a pertinent question which he does not answer: "IS the Trinil Race (?) pre-human or not?"

The popular opinion is that these evolutionists have reached positive and final conclusions, but read what Osborn says, page 77, "Men of the Old Stone Age:" "We may form our own opinion, however, from a fuller understanding of the specimens themselves, ALWAYS KEEPING IN MIND THAT IT IS A QUESTION WHETHER THE FEMUR (thigh bone) AND THE SKULL (the other piece of bone found as evidence of the "Trinil Race") BELONG TO THE SAME INDIVIDUAL OR EVEN TO THE SAME RACE." If this grave doubt exists why use the bones as evidence of evolution?

Now look at the facts in this case. The only remains of the now famous Trinil Ape-Man consist of a small section of a skull or brain-pan, two molar or back teeth and a piece of thigh bone unearthed in 1891 near Trinil, Java, by the intimate friend of Ernest Haeckel, Eugene Dubois, a Dutch military surgeon, who described his discovery FOUR YEARS LATER, September, 1895, at the Third International Congress of Zoologists at Leyden. One tooth and the piece of skull were found together, the other tooth and the thigh

bone together, but about 100 feet from the other bones, within the same year.

Dubois "reconstructed" these remants, declared they were neither ape nor man, and therefore could only be a connecting link between, naming it "Pithecanthropus Erectus" (ape-man standing upright).

The eminent Prof. Rudolf Virchow, President of the Congress, prudently observed that there was no evidence that the fragments of bone had ever formed part of the same creature, and it was still less possible to characterize such a compound of two creatures either as man or ape, since the thigh bone was evidently human, whereas the fragment of skull certainly belonged to a chimpanzee or a gibbon.

Even Osborn himself admits that the Trinil thigh bone is human and that the Trinil skull-cap is simian. Of the two teeth he says, in "Men of the Old Stone Age," page 81: "They do not resemble those of man closely enough to positively confirm the pre-human theory." Then why use it to confirm it?

Professor Schwalbe, often quoted by Osborn in support of other phases of evolution, says, "Vorgeschichte des Menschen," 1904, page 29: "The Pithecanthropus Erectus (Trinil Ape-Man) has no place in the genealogical line of man's direct ancestors."

Osborn holds that man's pedigree is not directly related to either living or fossil apes, but to some unknown and undiscovered species. He produces Pithecanthropus as our ancestor. Unfortunately for him, his own witnesses, Professor Schwalbe, Klaatsch and Alsberg, firmly believe Pithecanthropus to be on the same genealogical line as the modern ape. If these authorities are correct, man and the Trinil monstrosity

are not on the same family tree, and we are absolutely lost in a maze of contradictions.

Osborn, in spite of the fact that he has produced the Trinil Ape-Man as a "missing link" in No. 1 of his wonderful series of reconstructions, says, in "Men of the Old Stone Age," page 79: "There are, however, reasons for excluding Pithecanthropus from the direct ancestral line of the higher races of man." Of course there are many reasons for exclusion, but none for inclusion.

If he really believes what he has written, why in the name of common-sense, does he place in Case No. 1 eleven skulls and "reproductions," the five on the right being those of gibbon, orang-outang, chimpanzee, adult gorilla, and young gorilla, while the five on the left are reconstructed models of the exploded Piltdown, the mutilated Neanderthal, the shattered Talgai, the reconstructed Cro-Magnon, and a recent human skull? And WHY does he place in a specially made niche and exactly in the center of these two groupes, the more than doubtful bust of the Trinil Ape-Man as a missing link?

He does not say he has ever seen the Trinil Ape-Man. He does not say he knows where his remains are to be found for inspection, whether they still exist, although they have been discovered for thirty years. He does know that scientists are not permitted to examine them or even to see them. Knowing about all this secrecy, why does he not refer to it?

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, curator of the United States National Museum, was not allowed to examine or even to see them, and writes in Smithsonian Publication 2300, page 10: "It would surely seem proper and desirable that specimens of such value to science should

be freely accessible to well qualified investigators, and that accurate casts be made available to scientific institutions, particularly after twenty (now thirty) years have elapsed since the discovery of the original.

"Regrettable, however, all that has thus far been furnished to the scientific world is a cast of the skull-cap, the commercial replica of which yield measurements DIFFERENT FROM those reported taken of the original, and several not thoroughly satisfactory illustrations; no reproductions can be had of the femur and the teeth, and not only a study but even a view of the originals are denied to scientific men."

Why, then, does Professor Osborn speak as if he has seen, examined and measured them? Why the queer drawings instead of photographs? Why the significant silence as to these important and mysterious discrepancies?

And so the Trinil Ape-Man as a missing link fades from our view, an elusive phantom, an imaginary conception erected to support a hypothetical and utterly untenable idea as to the origin of man.

(II.) THE HEIDELBERG MAN

Professor Osborn says of this that it represents "a race which was perhaps the predecessor of the Neanderthal man in Europe." It is also described as "a precious document of man's evolution," being known also as the "Mauerjaw," because discovered near the village of Mauer in the Elsenz Valley, about six miles southeast of Heidelberg, by two laborers October 21, 1907. It is preserved in the Palaeontological Institute of Heidelberg University. While featured as the largest jaw thus far discovered, it has well-preserved and unquestionably human teeth.

In "Men of the Old Stone Age," page 100, we read: "It would seem that in the jaw and probably in all other characters of the skull (?) as they became known (?), the Heidelberg race (?) will be found to be a Neanderthal in the making, that is, a primitive, more powerful and more ape-like ancestral form."

And again: "The true Neanderthals rank exactly half way (?) between the most inferior races of man and the anthropoid apes * * * The discovery affords us one of the great missing links or types in the chain of human development."

There is an impressiveness in this confident assertion until we learn that there is no skull with this lower jaw, which was discovered 79 feet below the surface. How, then, can we hope to know any of its "other characters," which seem to give encouragement to the learned Professor?

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, discussing this specimen in "The Most Ancient Skeletal Remains of Man," page 23, removes the last vestige of hope when he states: "There can be but little hope that other parts of the same skull or skeleton will ever be discovered."

Much discussion has arisen over the comparatively small teeth belonging to this massive Heidelberg jaw, but our interest is lessened when we know that Professor Birkner, in the collection of the Munich Institute for Palaeontology, exhibits a modern Eskimo skull in which exactly the same features occur. Has Prof. Osborn overlooked the existence of this modern Eskimo jaw?

We really must repudiate the "precious" Heidelberg "document of man's evolution" as having any claim to being a "Missing link," since it turns out to

be nothing more than a large Eskimo lower jaw. Exit, Heidelberg!

(III.) THE GIBRALTAR MAN

is the next "reconstruction" to be studied. As usual, feeble, and barren speculations are called "facts," and by skillfully avoiding the many embarrassing difficulties which present themselves, Osborn concludes (page 217, "Men of the Old Stone Age") that: "The type skull of this great extinct race of men is that of Neanderthal, appreciated by Lydell and Huxley, but passed over by Darwin, and finally established by Schwalbe as the most important missing link between the existing species of modern man and the anthropoid apes." Again there is no doubt, no hesitation! But even a superficial scrutiny exposes the lamentable deficiencies of this Gibraltar skull.

It is now preserved in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, England, but no one knows anything concerning its history. It was first mentioned in Falconer's "Palaeontological Memoirs," published 1868. Even Prof. Osborn, quoting Dr. Hrdlicka, admits that "No record exists of the precise circumstances under which this interesting relic was found. It was yielded by the rocks many years since."

This is characteristically indefinite, but Prof. Keith, relying on Professor Broca, who recorded absolutely no facts of the discovery of the Gibraltar skull, if he ever knew them, thinks it was taken out from a "very compact and adherent gangue" in Forbes quarry on the north bank of the rock of Gibraltar, as early as 1848. Really, no one knows in what year it appeared, for the reason that nobody paid any attention to it until many years afterwards.

Prof. Osborn, in "Men of the Old Stone Age," page 216, says he doesn't know where the skull was found, and that although its age cannot be determined, it probably belonged to the Mousterian period. He really might have guessed anything as well as that. And yet in the same book, he declares with certainty that the Gibraltar skull was discovered in 1848 by Lieutenant Flint. He further says that the face and base of the cranium are remarkably complete. This is true of the base, but the face is sadly defective, in fact there is no lower jaw and the upper jaw is largely absorbed.

The skull is very small. Keith gives it a capacity of 1100 c. c., 225 c. c. less than the average modern white woman. Dr. Hrdlicka, in "The Most Ancient Skeletal Remains of Man," page 25, says: "There is a marked and quite heavy supraorbital (over the eye) arch." Osborn, on the other hand, speaks of "the slight development of the supraorbital ridges and the small size of the brain."

But, on page 217 of "The Men of the Old Stone Age," Osborn persists in saying: "It is finally established by Schwalbe as the most important missing link between the existing species of modern man and the anthropoid apes." Upon what he bases this statement, neither he nor anyone else has anywhere disclosed.

(IV.) THE NEANDERTHAL MAN

A piece of bone was found August, 1856, by two laborers digging in a small cave at the entrance of Neanderthal Gorge, Westphalia, Germany. Dr. Fuhlrohtt became interested and collected a well-preserved human thigh bone, several human arm bones, not so well preserved, fragments of a right arm and

forearm bone, a fragment of a human right shoulder blade, a small piece of a human right collar bone, and five broken pieces of rib.

All sorts of legends began to develop around these Neanderthal bones, among others was one which made them belong to a period in which the latest animals of the Diluvian period still existed, representing a peculiar and hitherto unknown type of ancient humanity, a very close relative to modern man, but "equally close to some pre-existing ape now extinct," that is, close to something of which nothing existed. An age was given to this race, ranging from 30,000 years to hundreds of thousands, just as one might prefer.

Even Prof. Schaffhausen admitted 60 years ago: "No proof of this assumption nor consequently of their so-termed fossil condition was afforded by the circumstances under which the bones were discovered."

Virchow and many others considered the bones to be diseased specimens.

From time to time similar skulls were found in different parts of Europe, and it was not long before the claim was made that it was a hitherto unknown type of humanity. For obvious reasons, the capacity of the skull must be placed low, midway between brute and man—between 600 c. c. and 1500 c. c., accordingly Prof. Schaffhausen called it 1033 c. c. Prof. Huxley was forced to correct this estimate and gave it a capacity of 1230 c. c.

Professor Osborn, in his exhibit now presenting unsupported opinions as established facts in the Hall of the Age of Man, describes the Neanderthal race as the "missing link." He labels Case 3, "the immediate predecessor of modern man, the Neanderthal race," notwithstanding the ever-growing body of evidence that

the Neanderthals were a race of blacks. He also includes in his Neanderthal circle the cast of a skull discovered at Spy, Belgium; casts of fragments of jaws from Malarnaud, France; fragments of a jaw from Krapina, Croetia; cast of a skull found at Le Moustier, France; cast of a skull from LaChapelle-Aux-Saints, France; "reconstructions" of a female skull found at Gibraltar, 1848 (already considered), including half of the soft parts of the head and a lower jaw restored from studies of ten other Neanderthal jaws.

Would it not be prudent and fair to inform the young and enthusiastic student of anthropology that there are now twelve complete opinions regarding the original Neanderthal skull? The original Neanderthal man has been variously described as an idiot, a Mongolian Cossack, an early German, an early Dutchman, an early Frieslander, a relative of the Australian blacks, a palaeolithic man, a primitive ape-man, etc., etc.

Would it not be honest to show that the outlines of the sagittal, median curve, drawn with Lissaeur's diograph by Macnamara, are almost identical with the skull of the modern Australian black?

Professor Rudolf Virchow is very clear in his statements. He says: "We may certainly regard it as decided that the brain-cast bears no resemblance to that of an ape, and even if the cranium is admitted to be a typical race-cranium, which I consider quite unjustifiable, it does not by any means follow that we may deduce from this that it approximates to that of an ape." An ape—remember, that does not now exist and of which no single trace has ever been found.

Even Professor Schaffenhausen declared in his "Der Neanderthal Fund," page 49: "In making this

discovery we have not found the missing link between man and the brute."

Professor Macnamara, in "Archiv fur Anthropologie," xxviii., page 349-360, states that "modern science is compelled to conclude that the Neanderthal skulls do not represent a distinct species of man and cannot therefore be looked upon as missing links, but must be classified as within the limits of variations of the species Homo Sapiens."

Professor Gorjanovic Kramberger, quoted by Prof. Osborn, proves conclusively that modern science connot and must not regard the Neanderthals and modern man as two distinct species, but merely two races of one and the same species. He says, "Biolog, Zentralblatt," page 810: "It is perfectly plain that the human remains hitherto discovered (referring to all the supposed Neanderthal specimens) all belong to one and the same species * * * proved by the numerous remains found at Krapina, which present many of the characteristics of modern man * * * proved also by many peculiarities that recur—at the present day. There are now larger jaws than the largest lower jaw found at Krapina. We still meet with broad, square dental arches, badly developed chins, and among the Australian blacks genuine supraorbital ridges."

How much nonsense has been written around these supraorbital ridges which give the beetling brows and the ferocious appearance to the fanciful "reconstructions" of the missing links connecting the ape with modern man!

Even Prof. Arthur Keith says: "We are compelled to admit that men of modern type had been in existence long before the Neanderthal type."

Professor Dwight, of Harvard, says: "For my part

I believe the Neanderthal man to be a specimen of a race not arrested in its upward climb, but thrown down from a higher position." This is degeneration from a higher level, not ascending evolution.

It surely is not necessary to spend further time on this exploded "missing link." The greatest authorities in the world have repudiated it. Get in line, Prof. Osborn.

(V.) THE RHODESIA MAN

At the November meeting of the Zoological Society, London, 1921, with Professor McBride, F. R. S., a vice-president of the Society, in the chair, the recently discovered and already famous Rhodesian cave man's skull, christened Homo Rhodesiensis by Dr. Arthur Smith Woodward, F. R. S. (Keeper of Geology at the National History Museum) was the object of discussion. It was announced that experts—unnamed—had given this "ape-like human" an age of 100,000 years. The public was informed that it may now be certain of its monkey origin.

Dr Woodward stated as his opinion that "Homo Rhodesiensis is decidedly a new link in the chain of evolution, and may prove to be the next grade after the Neanderthal man in the ascending series."

Despite the pronounced simian insinuations of the learned Doctor's remarks, in referring to the "immense size of the palate" of the Rhodesian skull, he admitted that it is "Nevertheless entirely human and beautifully domed—comparable with what we find in modern men, even singers. * * * There is nothing to suggest abnormality." And yet he continues: "As far as I can judge at present, the Rhodesian skull is that of a later man

than the Neanderthal man." How then, may we ask, could it have been 100,000 years old?

Professor Elliot Smith, another eminent authority, in discussing this specimen, gives utterance to a grotesque succession of imaginings and suppositions—eight in one paragraph! "Judged by the limbs alone, we would assume that we are dealing with a much more recent type than the Neanderthal man, but judging by the face we would imagine we are dealing with a much older type. As to the sex of the Rhodesian skull, there is the suggestion that it belonged to a woman in the prime of life. The sutures suggest that she was probably less than thirty years of age. When the face was clothed with flesh, I think it might have had widely-splayed nostrils like the gorilla, and in this respect it might have been less like a modern human being than might appear from the skull."

Rhodesia, named after Cecil Rhodes, is a British possession in South Central Africa, lying within the tropics. All the evidence indicates that this entire section of the world was once inhabited by black men, not white, and it may reasonably be inferred therefore that the skull of the Rhodesian cave man is the skull of a black.

The attempt made by some writers to create the impression that the skull was found more than 100 feet below the ground, suggests that the Rhodesian man was buried under successive sedimentary deposits, a fact, which if true, would lend weight to the theory that he was very old.

These are the circumstances. The remains were found in a cave by native laborers, who brought the bones to their overseer, a white man, and then went back to their digging. The facts are reported by

William Harris, who was at the mine at the time of the discovery. Some time later, Ross Macartney, the managing director of the Broken Hill mine, gave orders to stop work at that part of the mine and a systematic search for other specimens was made. In addition to the original bones there were found a clavicle (collar bone), a fragment of a scapula (shoulder blade), and a piece of coccyx joined the several sacral vertebrae (base of the spine).

Also, many animal bones were discovered with the human skull and the other human bones—bones of the lion, hyena, elephant, rhinoceros, horse, antelope, gnu, etc.—all modern species.

They also picked up many stone implements, such as the pestle and millstone for grinding grain, implements exactly like those which the African bushman uses today.

It is true the Rhodesian skull was found in a cave, the roof of which had at one time been more than 100 feet thick. Had it been a thousand feet thick instead of 100 it would have made little difference to the Rhodesian man who tumbled through a cleft in the roof, except for the bump at the end of the fall!

What were the pestle and millstone doing in the cave? They must have been used by the men who lived at that time, and the suggestions involved can hardly be reconciled with the habits of life of any prehistoric, ferocious ape-man classically pictured by Professor Knight in the Hall of Man, as a killer armed with a murderous club.

How explain the other certainly human bones found alongside? Is it unreasonable to conclude that all belong to the same period and are all human?

Contradicting Professor Woodward, Professor

G. Elliot Smith declares that "the Rhodesian man is a half-developed Neanderthal man." Dr. Woodward states that he "is decidedly a new link—the next grade after the Neanderthal man in the ascending series." Take your choice!

In the Atlantic Monthly, April 1922, G. Elliot Smith not only puts the ape-man of Java and the Piltdown of England into respectable society as genuinely unblemished missing links, but he refers also to "the fossil man of Rhodesia," as possessing a face "more definitely primitive and brutal than that of any other human being, living or extinct, that is at present known. The enormous eyebrow ridges are bigger, even than those of the most archaic member of the human family, the Java Ape-Man; and in the extent and form of their lateral extensions, they recall the condition found in man's nearest simian relative, the gorilla. The nose of the Rhodesian man was definitely more ape-like than that of Neanderthal man."

There are many facts which glaringly refute the missing-link theory. There is not only nothing in the bone deposits to suggest great age, but there is much to indicate that the Rhodesian man or woman fell into the heap at a comparatively recent date.

Even Professor Smith himself says: "The cleft (in the roof of the cave) does leave open the possibility of the human beings having fallen into the cave at a more recent period."

The evidence is overwhelming as to the recent origin of the Rhodesian skull. None of the human bones are fossilized, although all the bones of the modern animals found with them are completely fossilized. This fossilization must have taken place at a rapid rate on account of the immediate proximity and abundance of extremely active salts of zinc.

The fact that the human skull is not in the least fossilized proves conclusively that the human bones got into the cave at a very much later date than the bones of the modern animals which it was discovered.

All the other human bones present no extraordinary features, and the skull itself exhibits some very modern characteristics. The teeth are badly decayed, but dental decay is unknown among the palaeolthic Europeans. The opening in the back of the skull is exactly like that of modern man, so situated as to assure an upright position to the head without any forward inclination, such as is the distinctively brutish characteristic of ALL apes, without exception.

The third molar tooth, as with modern man, is notably smaller than the second. The thickness of the skull does not differ from the European skull of 1923. The palate is entirely human, well adjusted for articulate speech.

The eyebrow ridges are indeed heavy, and the slope of the forehead is not exactly normal, but these features are far from proving that the possessor was in any way a "missing link."

The Rhodesian cave man was undoubtedly an African black who fell into the cave of the Broken Hill mine through the cleft in the roof, carrying his implements with him. The same fate met many other men and many modern animals as well. This link in evolutionary chain proves to be a weak one and our search remains unrewarded. But we shall persist, and will now examine another bit of evidence (?).

(VI). PILTDOWN MAN

This is No. 2 of the four specimens in the four glass cases in the Hall of the Age of Man, American Museum of Natural History, New York.

As exhibited to the uninitiated the Piltdown man is half ape, half man, but an examination of the facts of the discovery of the few bones from which this "reconstruction" is made by the exercise of a curious and credulous imagination, will show the great weakness of this "link."

Walking along a farm road close to Piltdown Common, Fletching (Sussex), Mr. Charles Dawson "noticed that the road had been mended with some peculiar brown flints not usual in the district." On inquiry he was "astonished" to learn that they had been dug from a gravel bed on the farm. Dawson's statements are somewhat vague, but it would appear that the "discovery" and the "astonishment" occurred sometime in 1909 or 1910, although it was not until December 18th, 1912, that he revealed his find.

On a subsequent visit, a laborer handed him a small portion of unusually thick human parietal bone that looked as if it "might be" 300,000 years old. On another later occasion, in the autumn of 1911, he picked up another and larger piece of bone belonging to the frontal region of a skull, including a portion of the ridge extending over the left eyebrow.

Mr. Dawson took the bones to Dr. A. Smith Woodward of the British Museum. After much talk, a systematic search was made among the heaps of gravel, and the total results consisted of another piece of occipital bone from the skull, a piece of a jaw bone and a canine or dog tooth.

With these few fragments, the scientists "reconstructed" the Piltdown man and at once proclaimed it to be a new genus which they proceeded to call Eoanthropus or "Dawn Man," naming the species "Dawsoni" in honor of the discoverer.

To make the thing sensational it was necessary to manufacture a "reconstruction" with as close a resemblance to the ape as possible. The nearer to the brute, the more convincing as "scientific evidence" in support of the "missing link" theory.

The skull, of course, must have a capacity midway between that of the ape, 600 c. c., and that of a human, 1500 c. c. According Dr. A. Smith Woodward and Mr. Charles Dawson made their calculations and gave to their Piltdown man a brain capacity, very accurately and very precisely fixed at 1070 c. c.

In August, 1913, when the Piltdown fragments had increased by two molar teeth and two nasal bones, the British Association for the Advancement of Science held its annual meeting. At this gathering Professor Arthur Keith, curator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, shattered the hopes of the evolutionists by demonstrating that the brain capacity of the Piltdown skull was nearer 1500 c. c., than 1070 c. c.

Following this exposure, Professors McGregor and Woodward proceeded to create some new "reconstructions," so that Mr. Piltdown's cranium is now estimated by them at approximately 1300 c. c. But this figure is much too far from 600 c. c. to be comfortable for the argument, and they must somehow give the Piltdown freak an ape-like face and jaw. So the solitary canine tooth is placed very conveniently on the right side of the lower jaw at an angle suggestive of the ape.

But now along comes Professor W. K. Gregory and Professor G. S. Miller, writing respectively in the American Museum Journal, vol. 14, 1914, pages 189-200, and Smithsonian Misc. Coll., vol. 65, No. 12, Nov., 1915, proving that the tooth described and used

as the right lower canine, was no lower tooth of any kind, and not even a right tooth, but a left tooth and and upper one at that. Alas! Alas! the Piltdown "missing link" is slipping badly.

Professor Ales Hrdlicka, writing in the Smithsonian report for 1913, pages 491-552, re-published by the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1916, throws us into a new pit of confusion and chaos. He says: "The most important development in the study of the Piltdown remains * * * the jaw and tooth belong to a fossil chimpanzee."

This is a heartbreaking admission, concurred in by no less an eminent authority than Professor Gerrit S. Miller of the United States National Museum, both scientists urging that none of the conclusions regarding the Piltdown man should be accepted, and that all hypotheses relating to it must be regarded as more or less premature.

No wonder the great German anatomist, G. Schwalbe, so frequently quoted by Professor Osborn, had to abandon the "missing link" opinion so picturesquely and noisily voiced as a scientific fact when he declared that "the proper restoration of the Piltdown fragments would make them belong, not to any preceding stage of man, but to a well developed, good sized Homo Sapiens, the true man of today."

Among many noted scientists who have repudiated the Piltdown "missing link," special mention may be made of Sir Ray Lankester, one of the most distinguished English authorities; Professor David Waterson of the University of London, Kings College; Professor W. D. Matthew of the American Museum of Natural History; and Professor George Grant MacCurdy of Yale University, who wrote in Science, February 18,

1916, page 228-231, of the humiliating Piltdown exposure, referring to the thing as creature "robbed of a muzzle that ill became him."

Why are these facts not given to the public by the men who persist in labelling this monstrosity a "missing link?" Why do they not tell us the truth, that the Piltdown skull is clearly a human one beneath which the evolutionists have modelled the face of a chimpanzee and so, according to Professor Keith, produced "an impossible animal that could neither breathe nor eat."

Why not tell us about the scientists of world renown who have laughed at this enormous fabrication —men like Professor H. Klaatsch, recognized and quoted in other matters by Prof. Osborn; Professor Hertwig, Professor MacNamara; the great paleontologist Branco, director of the Geological and Paleontological Institute of Berlin University?

Why not give us the opinion of the great Professor Virchow, who declared that "the man-ape has no existence and the missing link remains a phantom?"

(VII). SUMMARY

Little remains to be said on this subject. Professor Osborn proves by his own table of successive "discoveries" that he is conscious not merely of confusion, but also of misstatement. Mentioning seventeen discoveries in chronological order from 1848 to 1914, he says: "Some of these are now recognized as missing links between the existing human species and the antropoid apes."

Of the seventeen discoveries ten are Neanderthal. But these, he says, are not missing links. Therefore we

must find the missing links among the remaining seven discoveries.

One of the remaining seven is the Trinil Ape-Man, whose ignominous collapse has been dealt with. One of the remaining six is the exploded Piltdown man. This leaves but five discoveries, one of which is the Heidelberg jaw.

Of this Heidelberg jaw Osborn himself says, page 99, "Men of the Old Stone Age:" "It is absolutely certain that these remains are human. They show no trace of being intermediate between man and the anthropoid ape."

This Heidelberg jaw must then be discarded as one of the discoveries called "missing links." But Osborn himself repudiates it in one breath and accepts it in the next. He says: "We may consider the Heidelberg jaw as pre-Neanderthaloid."

Now, the Neanderthals and pre-Neanderthals must be human beings—true men, or they must be missing links connecting true men with apes. In one sentence Prof. Osborn infers they are one, and in the next the other.

However, as science, regardless of the Professor's confused statement, does not recognize the Heidelberg jaw as a missing link, there are but four other discoveries to justify his vague declaration.

These are two skulls discovered 1867, at Furfooz, Belgium; three skeletons and fragments of two others discovered 1868, and known as the Cro-Magnon, Dordogne; two skeletons discovered 1901, in the Grimaldi Grotto, Mentone; and two skeletons discovered 1914 at Oberkrassel, near Bonn, Germany.

Two of these, the discoveries of 1868 and 1914, are described as "comparatively modern Cro-Magnon

true men," and cannot therefore be recognized as missing links.

Of the two specimens left, the Furfooz skulls were discovered by Dupont, 1867, in a cave near Furfooz, in the Valley of the Lesse, Belgium. They are described as a highly developed race of men, whose descendants are the broad-headed races now found in Holland and Denmark. Osborn himself quotes this opinion: ("Men of the Old Stone Age," page 485). Of course he does not refer to the Furfooz skulls as recognized missing links.

There is nothing left, then, but the Grimaldi skeletons of 1901, found in the Grottes de Grimaldi, near Mentone, described as displaying "a number of resemblances to the African negroid race."

Boule is responsible for most of the ideas now in circulation regarding the bones found in the Grimaldi Grotto, which really consist of two sets of remains—one belonging to the African negroid race, the other to the Cro-Magnon race. Since both of these are admitted by evolutionists to be later races than the Neanderthals, we are farther away than ever from the missing link, as without doubt no son could ever have appeared before the birth of his father!

Evidently the reason that Professor Osborn avoids specific mention of a single one of the seventeen discoveries as a missing link, is because there is no missing link among them.

Endeavoring to explain his own contradictions by the use of another group of contradictions of certain "authorities" selected by him, because they seem, unless too closely inspected, to support his own opinions, Professor Osborn, in "Men of the Old Stone Age," page 54, as Arthur Thomson does in "Outline of

Science," vol. 1, publishes the ancestral tree of the anthropoid apes and men.

They begin with the "unknown ancestral stock" of the Old World primates, including man, one branch of which leads to the small monkeys of Egypt and the Macaques of Asia and Europe. Another branch became the Propliopithecus, one of whose children was the orang of Asia, another the gorilla of Africa, a third the chimpanzee of Africa, a fourth the gibbon of Asia, and a fifth led to the "Unknown Pliocene ancestors of man," from whom "in the order of descent" are placed the "Trinil Ape-Man," the "Heidelberg man," the "Piltdown man," the "Neanderthal man," more primitive species, human and pre-human, than the "Cro-Magnon" and other races, and finally on top of the tree, Homo Sapiens, meaning you and the rest of us.

The student who does not examine closely as he looks at that tree, would quickly conclude that the Trinil Ape-Man came out of pure ape; that the Heidelberg man, still very much ape, came out of the Trinil Ape-Man; that the Piltdown man, still very gorilla-like, came out of the Heidelberg man; that the Neanderthal man, with many apish characteristics still clinging to his squat ferocity, came out of the Piltdown man; that other pre-human and human primitives came out of the Neanderthal man; that the Cro-Magnon and more highly developed races came out of these primitive sub-men, and that in turn, out of the Cro-Magnon cave man, who was an improvement on all the others, came modern man.

Our study proves that nothing is further from the truth than these strange but momentous conclusions. According to the evolutionist, everyone may grow his own family ancestral tree. Each may become his own

modeller, and depending entirely upon his skill in art, may manufacture his own "reconstructions," but in doing so must forever ignore the irrefutable evidence of contemporary races.

Otherwise his series of "progressive" stages breaks down and his connecting links are lost. Above all, he must avoid candor and truth and abandon reason.

Everything must begin with what is described as the "unknown," as far as paleontology is concerned. Everything may end according to the formula of H. G. Wells, who, in his "Outline of History," takes what is unknown, labels it "known," and then tells the world this is "advanced science," "stripped of all superstition, mysticism, theology and other nonsense!"

H. G. Wells is suffering from "the blind staggers of science," as anyone must who indulges in the sort of reasoning that he adopts. That this so-called "science" has appropriated so much self-certified dignity, and has fooled so many "educated" men, will ever remain one of the mysteries of this ouija-board age.

The reader who has travelled thus far through the inextricably confused "missing link" jumble which science has presented to us, and which science itself is unable to unravel, because of the complicated, involved, corrupted and contradictory opinions of scientists writing on the subject—knows all that H. G. Wells ever knew or ever could know concerning these paleontological specimens.

A consideration of the conclusions of Wells, Osborn, Thomson, and many others, presented white-hot in the name of stone-cold science, shows that "science" has become, through the betrayal of its own high priests, the plaything of romancers, novelists, and mountebanks.